



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/412-955 03/29/96 GARDENSMITH

0811/0930

TERESA A HENDRICKS
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACHS
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON MA 02210-2211

E: 00441/7046

EXAMINER

POPE, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

8

2617

DATE MAILED:

09/12/96

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☒ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. ☒ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1-2, 5-9, 11-16 are rejected.

5. ☒ Claims 3-4, 10 are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2617

Part III DETAILED ACTION

ART REJECTION:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. **Claims 1-2,5-9, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Dev et al(Dev).**

-- In considering claim 16, the claimed subject matter that is met by Dev et al includes:

1) the claimed database of policy-based filters is met by the external database having event filters(see: column 8, lines 21-33);

2) the claimed user interface is met by the interface(10, figure 1, column 4, lines 1-9);

Art Unit: 2617

3) the claimed processor and memory device including a program is met by the virtual network machine(12) including network protocol(see: column 4, lines 18-57);

4) the claimed program including means for receiving, means for applying, and means for forwarding is met(see: column 8, lines 16-63).

- Dev does not show:

1) receiving alarms from a plurality of servers.

Since Dev does teach receiving an alarm from a single server, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art augment the system so as to receive alarms from a plurality of servers, since this would have enhanced the operability of the system by expanding the system.

-- Claim 1 recites a method that was met with regards to the discussion of the apparatus in claim 16 above(see: column 8, lines 16-63).

-- In considering claim 2, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to assign a plurality of filters to the network management application, since a plurality of event messages would have been present on the network, and therefore, a plurality of filters would have been necessary in order to differentiate between the different requested messages to be displayed.

Art Unit: 2617

As well, all other claimed subject matter is met by Dev, as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above.

-- In considering claim 5, it would have been obvious to store a policy name, since various policies would have existed on the network, and therefore, assigning and storing a name to each policy would have been necessary in order to identify each specific policy.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious that the applications would have been accessible to all servers, so as to ensure that the information with regards to the event messages would have been readily accessible to all users of the system.

As well, all other claimed subject matter is met as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 2 above.

-- In considering claim 6, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to tag each filter, since a plurality of filters would have been utilized in order to obtain specific event messages, and therefore, a tag of each filter would have been necessary in order to identify different filters.

As well, all other claimed subject matter is met as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above.

-- In considering claim 7, it would have been obvious to specify the tag for the filter which the alarm passed, since it would have been necessary to obtain information with regards to identifying the location of the alarm.

Art Unit: 2617

As well, all other claimed subject matter is met as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 6 above.

-- In considering claim 8, since the event messages are included in a database, it would have been obvious that the filters also would have been stored in the database, since the filters are utilized for processing event messages which are on the database.

As well, all other claimed subject matter is met as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above.

-- Claim 9 recites subject matter that was met by Dev as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above, as well as:

1) the claimed specified user name in the alarm notification is met(see: column 8, lines 21-32).

-- In considering claims 11 and 15, upon termination of an alarm status, it would have been obvious that an alarm clear message would have been forwarded to the network management application and network management server, such that the system would have been reset to a normal mode the indication of which being supplied to all devices on the network.

As well, all other claimed subject matter is met as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above.

-- In considering claim 12, since the use of assigning filters to a single network management application, it would have been

Art Unit: 2617

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to assign the same filters to multiple associated network management applications, since this would have merely duplicated a concept that is already taught by Dev, and thereby would have multiplied the effectiveness of the filter assignment process.

As well, all other claimed subject matter is met as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above.

-- Claim 13 recites subject matter that was met by Dev as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above, as well as:

1) the claimed graphical user interface is met(see: column 12, lines 64 et seq; column 13, lines 1-11).

-- Claim 14 recites subject matter that was met as discussed with reference to the discussion of claim 1 above, as well as:

1) the claimed notification containing information is met(see: column 8, lines 56-63).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 3-4, and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Serial Number: 08/412955

-7-

Art Unit: 2617

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daryl C. Pope whose telephone number is (703) 305-4838. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 to 5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Hofsass, can be reached on (703) 305-4717. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3988.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8576.

Daryl C. Pope

D.C.P.

Sept. 25, 1996


JEFFERY HOFSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2600